



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,653	09/12/2001	Robert A. Koch	60027.0042US01/BS01191	1170

45695 7590 06/16/2005

WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH
P. O. BOX 71355
MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/955,653

Applicant(s)

KOCH, ROBERT A.

Examiner

Ryan F Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 3/21/2005.
3. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1,9,17 are independent claims. In the Amendment A, Claims 1-24 were amended. This action is final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "each server" in lines 9 and 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6,8-18,22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bedingfield, Sr ("Bedingfield", US2005/0050460) in view of Wolfe ("Wolfe", US 6341305).

As per independent claim 1, Bedingfield teaches a method for providing a notification that events have occurred, the method comprising: receiving a request ([0018] lines 13-16) to provide a notification in response to the occurrence of the event to a client computer, the request comprising a description of the event and a user identifier ([0018] lines 10-20); determining whether the event has occurred ([0005] lines 20-21); and in response to determining that the event has occurred, identifying a network address for the client computer based on the user identifier (Figure 5, [0018] lines 15-18); and transmitting a request to the client computer at the network address to provide the notification that the event has occurred ([0005] lines 3-10); and opening a new user interface window at the client computer for each notification where each new user interface window is dedicated to displaying each notification in response to receiving each request ([0020] lines 14-16). However, Bedingfield fails to disclose multiple sources. Wolfe discloses multiple computer sources over a computer network that delivers a window for each notification (Figure 49, in each window a specified server is stated). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Bedingfield with the teaching of Wolfe. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a user with a multitude of resources depending on an individual's interests or task.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Bedingfield-Wolfe teaches a user interface window including a description of the event (Bedingfield, [0020] lines 12-

16).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Bedingfield-Wolfe teaches the user interface displayed over one or more currently active windows (Bedingfield, [0020] lines 14-16; inherent that a pop-up presides over all other windows).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Bedingfield-Wolfe teaches the user interface window comprising one or more hyperlinks referencing a networking location having additional information regarding the event (Column 17 lines 14-27).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Bedingfield-Wolfe teaches a method wherein the request to provide a notification further comprises data for customizing the notification, wherein transmitting a request to the client computer to provide the notification that the event has occurred further comprises transmitting the data for customizing the notification, and wherein the user interface window further comprises the data for customizing the notification

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Bedingfield-Wolfe teaches a method wherein identifying a network address for the client computer based on the user identifier comprises querying a network service provider or other network database for the network address of the client computer (Wolfe, Column 19 lines 23-26)

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Bedingfield-Wolfe teaches a method wherein the request to provide a notification in response to the occurrence of the event is received at a business web server (Wolfe, Column 17 lines 56-67).

Claim 9 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 10 is similar in scope to that of claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is similar in scope to that of claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to that of claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to that of claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to that of claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to that of claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 17, Bedingfield-Wolfe teaches wherein said visual indication that said event has occurred further comprises a hyperlink, and wherein said client computer is further operative to receive a selection of

said hyperlink and, based on said selection, send a data message (Bedingfield, [0016] lines 21-28).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 17, Bedingfield-Wolfe teaches a method wherein multiple user interface windows are displayed simultaneously (Wolfe, Figure 48).

7. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bedingfield, Sr ("Bedingfield", US2005/0050460) in view of Wolfe ("Wolfe", US 6341305) in view of Nawaz et al ("Nawaz", US 5959621).

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 17, Bedingfield-Wolfe fails to teach a billing server computer. However, Nawaz teaches further comprising a billing server computer, and wherein said visual indication that said event has occurred further comprises a hyperlink, and wherein said client computer is further operative to receive a selection of said hyperlink and, based on said selection, to place an order with said billing server computer (Nawaz, column 9, lines 14-24). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Bedingfield-Wolfe with the current teaching of Nawaz. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a way of reminding a user that a certain bill is overdue.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 17, Bedingfield-Wolfe fails to teach a calendaring server computer. However, Nawaz teaches further comprising a

Art Unit: 2174

calendaring server computer, and wherein said visual indication that said event has occurred further comprises a hyperlink, and wherein said client computer is further operative to receive a selection of said hyperlink and, based on said selection, to create an appointment with said calendaring server computer (Nawaz, column 9, line 15-24 and column 10, line 29-37; Microsoft outlook supports calendar for scheduling events). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Bedingfield-Wolfe with the current teaching of Nawaz. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a way of alerting a user of any conflicts in appointments that he or she may have.

4. Claims 7 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bedingfield, Sr ("Bedingfield", US2005/0050460) and Wolfe ("Wolfe", US 6341305) in view Timm et al. (US. # 6,055,268).

With respect to claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Bedingfield-Wolfe fails to teach wherein said request to display a visual indication that said event has occurred is transmitted to said client computer over a high-speed always-on network connection. However, Timm teaches wherein said request to display a visual indication that said event has occurred is transmitted to said client computer over a high-speed always-on network connection (Timm, column 16, line 57-62). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include Timm's high-speed always-on network connection with Bedingfield-Wolfe client computer for non-stop lightning fast connectivity.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to that of claim 7 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bedingfield, Sr ("Bedingfield", US2005/0050460) and Wolfe ("Wolfe", US 6341305) in view of Buhler (US. # 6,104,704).

With respect to claim 21, which is dependent on claim 17, Bedingfield-Wolfe fails to disclose wherein at least one of the notifications that one of the events has occurred further comprises a hyperlink, and wherein said client computer is further operative to receive a selection of said hyperlink and, based on said selection, to place a telephone call. However, Buhler teaches wherein said visual indication that said event has occurred further comprises a hyperlink, and wherein said client computer is further operative to receive a selection of said hyperlink and, based on said selection, to place a telephone call (Buhler, column 3, line 25-33). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include Buhler's telephone call with Bedingfield-Wolfe 's client computer to establish active communication to gather additional information regarding any event.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm M-Th, and alternating F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Patent Examiner
Art unit 2174

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100